R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 430 FL 000 036

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANNUAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE CONFERENCE (31ST, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NOVEMBER 13, 1965).

BY- GUERRA, EMILIO L. AND OTHERS
NEW YORK UNIV., N.Y., SCH. OF EDUCATION

PUB DATE 13 NOV 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.16 29P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COMPUTATIONAL LINGUISTICS, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, *MODERN LANGUAGES, *PROGRAMING PROBLEMS, *VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, PRONUNCIATION INSTRUCTION, WORD FREQUENCY, *CONFERENCES, NEW YORK CITY

THE SIX PAPERS COLLECTED IN THIS VOLUME DISCUSS CHANGES WHICH HAVE OCCURRED IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN RECENT YEARS. THE PRINCIPAL PRESENTATION MADE AT THE CONFERENCE, "SOME THOUGHTS ON PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE," BY W. FREEMAN TWADDELL, DEALS PRIMARILY WITH THE PROBLEMS FACING THE PROGRAMER WHO WORKS WITH PRONUNCIATION PRACTICE AND VOCABULARY EXPANSION. TOPICS TREATED BRIEFLY BY OTHER SPEAKERS ARE "COMPUTATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO LANGUAGE TEACHING," JOHN E. ALLEN, III, "THE USE OF NEW MEDIA AND MATERIALS," DORA S. BASHOUR, "CHANGES IN TEACHER PREPARATION," LEO U. BERNARDO, "CHANGES IN OBJECTIVES AND CURRICULUM," GLADYS LIPTON, AND "EVALUATION OF LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT AND INSTRUCTION," ROBERT J. LUDWIG. (AM)

PROCEEDINGS

Thirty-first Annual
Foreign Language Conference
at New York University

November 13, 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED011430

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Department of Foreign Languages
and International Relations Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Staff of the Department of Foreign Languages and International Relations Education, 1965-1966	i
Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual Foreign Language Conference at New York University	ii
Introduction	iii
Introduction of the Conference Theme	1
Some Thoughts on Past, Future, and Present	4
Computational Contributions to Language Teaching	12
The Use of New Media and Materials	14
Changes in Teacher Preparation	16
Changes in Objectives and Curriculum	17
Evaluation of Language Achievement and Instruction	19

STAFF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
AND
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS EDUCATION

1965 - 1966

Emilio L. Guerra, Ph.D., Chairman of the Department

Samuel I. Appell, Ph.D.

Christian O. Arndt, Ph.D.

Anna E. Balakian, Ph.D.

William A. Fuller, Jr., M.S.

Gladys C. Lipton, Ed.M.

Emma Menna, A.M.

Guy Nardo, Ph.D.

Theodore F. Nuzzi, A.M.

Alda M. Pizzinger, Ph.D.

Irma L. Silberberg, Ph.D.

Maurice Silver, Ph.D.

Herman B. Slutzkin, Ph.D.

Miss Carolyn Dine, Secretary

PROCEEDINGS OF
THE THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL
FOREIGN LANGUAGE CONFERENCE
AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

NOVEMBER 13, 1965

FOREWORD

Our Annual Foreign Language Conference needs no introduction to the profession. For more than thirty years, teachers, supervisors, and others interested in foreign language instruction have been meeting at New York University during the early part of the month of November to discuss various aspects of foreign language teaching. The Conference has always been and continues to be a cooperative venture from the initial planning stage to its final realization. As Vice Dean John Payne once said on an earlier occasion:

"We at New York University are the hosts, and not the prophets, the conveners and not the exclusive givers of the word. The spirit of this conference is one of common devotion to a cause in which we all believe."

It is thus most fitting and proper that we should express our thanks to all those persons and organizations in the field of foreign language teaching that have been largely responsible for whatever success this Annual Conference may have achieved.

EMILIO L. GUERRA
Conference Chairman

INTRODUCTION

The Thirty-First Annual Foreign Language Conference was held under the supervision of the Department of Foreign Languages and International Relations Education, as part of the Diamond Jubilee Program of the New York University School of Education.

The theme of the Conference was: "An Appraisal of Changes in Foreign Language Instruction." This was considered in a variety of aspects by the principal speaker, W. Freeman Twaddell, Professor of German and Linguistics at Brown University:

1. Changes in objectives and curriculum
2. Contributions of other disciplines to foreign language instruction
3. Use of new media and materials
4. Evaluation of language achievement and of instruction
5. Changes in methods of teacher preparation

Emilio L. Guerra, Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages and International Relations Education, School of Education, New York University, served as Chairman of the Conference.

Dr. Maxim Newmark, Chairman of the Department of Foreign Languages at the Franklin D. Roosevelt High School, was the Conference Moderator.

Milton Schwebel, Associate Dean of the School of Education of New York University, greeted the audience warmly, welcomed them to this Thirty-First Conference and touched on the theme of the Conference by pointing out that nowadays we conceive of a foreign language teacher as doing something more than drilling paradigms; it is part of his function to develop the "capacity to recognize diversity, appreciate it, tolerate it, even revel in it."

The members of the discussion panel were:

John E. Allen, III, Instructor in Russian, New York University

Dora S. Bashour, Professor of French, Hunter College

Leo U. Benardo, Assistant to the Principal, Harold G. Campbell Junior High School, New York, New York

Gladys Lipton, Coordinator of FLES Program, Elementary Schools of the City of New York

Robert J. Ludwig, Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages, Mt. Pleasant High School, Schenectady, New York

The articles that follow will give the substance of the conference discussion. It is, however, impossible to recapture the enthusiasm, interest, and concern of the audience, who filled the auditorium and had searching questions for each of the panelists prior to the summary made by Leo Benardo.

The Conference Committee consisted of the following:

John E. Allen, III
Samuel I. Appell
Christian O. Arndt
Anna E. Balakian
Dora S. Bashour
Leo U. Benardo
Irving H. Berenson
Thomas W. Bishop
Mendor T. Brunetti
Brother Joseph A. Cussen
Ralph Ghetti
Abraham A. Glicksberg
Emilio L. Guerra
Theodore Huebener
Abraham I. Katsh
Gladys Lipton
Robert J. Ludwig
Lucy A. Massey
Brother C. P. McDonnell
Silvio Muschera
Guy Nardo
Theodore F. Nuzzi
F. André Paquette
Alda M. Pizzinger
David Rudavsky
Maurice Silver
Wilmarth H. Starr
Herman B. Slutzkin
J. Richard Toven
W. Freeman Twaddell
Israel Walker
Donald Walsh

The cooperating associations were:

American Association of Teachers of French
American Association of Teachers of German
American Association of Teachers of Hebrew
American Association of Teachers of Italian
American Association of Teachers of Slavic and Eastern European Languages
American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese
Association of Foreign Language Chairmen and Supervisors of Long Island High Schools
Association of Foreign Language Chairmen of New York
Modern Language Association of America
Modern Language Teachers' Council of the Archdiocese of New York
National Association of Professors of Hebrew
National Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations

New York Classical Club
New York State Federation of Foreign Language Teachers

MAURICE SILVER
Editor of the Proceedings

INTRODUCTION OF THE CONFERENCE THEME

Maxim Newmark

As a close friend, colleague, and collaborator of Dr. Huebener, it was only natural for me to be called on to take his place during his temporary incapacity. I should like to point out that my case is different from that of the usual understudy or substitute. I am not a last-minute replacement. I had plenty of time to perpetrate this introduction and I don't have to apologize for being unprepared. Also, I am not merely reading a message composed by Dr. Huebener. These introductory remarks are entirely my own, and any instances of slipshod diction and malice aforethought are strictly intentional, resulting from a sincere unawareness of my limitations. Now that I have duly warned you, let us turn to the conference theme.

"An Appraisal of Changes in Foreign Language Instruction" — for the sake of simplicity, one could begin by mentioning some of the important changes that have recently come about in the areas listed in today's program. It would also be comparatively simple to mention some of the objective effects of these changes in the various areas. After all, the changes and their quantitative effect on the instructional program are a matter of record. To determine this record is merely a process of compilation. This has already been done at periodic intervals since the inception of the National Defense Education Act and the Language Development Program. The results have been published by the Government Printing Office, in the PMLA, and in special publications produced under contract with the United States Office of Education. From these statistical compilations we can determine changes in the length of the foreign language curriculum, changes in foreign language college entrance requirements, foreign language requirements for college degrees, changes in foreign language enrollments at the different levels of instruction, changes in teacher certification requirements and procedures, changes in state and local educational organizations with reference to the supervision of foreign language instruction, etc., etc. Through these statistical studies, we can also determine what changes have come about in the numbers, types, and uses of audio-visual aids, language laboratories, systems of programmed instruction, and so on.

However, when we come to the appraisal of these changes, we approach a more sensitive aspect of our theme, more sensitive because it involves qualitative or value judgments rather than compilation of data. Among these qualitative aspects are the appraisal of changes in objectives and methods and the contributions to language instruction of linguistics, psychology, cultural anthropology and sociology, not to mention the penumbral areas variously referred to as "applied

linguistics," "psycho-linguistics," and "linguistics." Here we must determine whether the effects of change in foreign language instruction are positive or negative, beneficial or detrimental, in terms of learning. Those of us who have achieved a sense of humility throughout years of change know in advance that our judgments will inevitably be colored by personal experience, but we shall be in a better position to maintain the general validity of our experience if we can cite a considerable body of supporting research. Needless to say, it is in the aspect of appraisal that controversy abounds.

I should not like to dwell unduly on the controversial aspects of our theme, and I certainly do not wish to anticipate any of the prepared statements and discussions that are to follow, but it would be less than realistic to pretend that controversy does not exist. In fact, I will be disappointed if we don't have some lively exchanges later on in the program. Meanwhile, without going into detail and without being too specific, it would be useful to indicate some of the contradictions that to me seem implicit in a few of our unsolved problems.

1. Why do some opponents of the audiolingual approach condemn it because it is not new, and then in almost the same breath maintain that they have always been using this approach anyhow?

2. Why do some adherents of the audiolingual approach go to great pains to demonstrate what vast differences there are between the learning of a first language in childhood and the learning of a second language thereafter, and then turn right about and claim that the language learning sequence of listening—pronouncing—reading—writing is the only correct one because that is the "natural" sequence in which children learn their first language?

3. Why are some city and state educational authorities still holding their foreign language examinations to a simplistic level of achievement which equates three levels with three years, ignoring the fact that the audiolingual approach, to which they pay lip service, requires a longer incubation period?

4. Why do some supervisors and administrators persist in pretending that the reorganization of foreign language instruction at all levels and the achievement of articulation are accomplished facts?

5. Why are some of our own colleagues who together with the entire language teaching profession agitated for longer se-

quences of foreign language study now opposed to such longer sequences in elementary and junior high schools?

Questions such as these will no doubt be discussed in the course of our Conference. We who labor in the vineyards of the classroom and who are sorely beset, we look to this Conference and to the assembled leaders in our profession for direction and guidance deriving from their practical experience; but above all, we look to them for sound theoretical doctrine to give us faith and inspiration.

SOME THOUGHTS ON PAST, FUTURE, AND PRESENT

W. F. Twaddell

Now, on the threshold of the last third of the twentieth century, there are few professions that are not aware of a sense of change, of urgency, of the continuing need for adjustment or retraining. Certainly our own profession is anything but stagnant; indeed, many of us are twitchy with the sense of changes already experienced and those still to come.

Among the important recent changes in our objectives and methods, the most publicized has been an intensified focus on listen-and-speaking competence as an initial phase of foreign language learning. The labels for this phase, or this focus, have not been happy ones. The "oral approach" instantly raised the question: "Approach to what?" "Aural-oral" has proved something of a tongue-twister. A recent coinage, "Audio-lingual," seems too naive with regard to phonetics to be respectable. Maybe before long we will be hearing of the acoustico-articulatory solution of all our problems. However, despite the disguises, we all know approximately what is referred to, and we recognize it as different from what preceded it in our professional history: the so-called grammar-reading era.

Looking back over our recent history, we can see that as always in major developments there has been a confluence of several factors:

1. The experience of the Army Specialized Training Program in World War II has never wholly died out in our profession. That experience involved experimentation in the teaching of less familiar languages, and had a focus on listening comprehension and speaking competence. New techniques were worked out, some of which were readily adaptable to the teaching of the familiar languages in school conditions.

2. Another influence on our foreign language profession has been from the practice of teaching English to speakers of other languages. Such teaching of English as a foreign language in America usually had aural-oral focus. The learner of English in America was usually one who could do some reading but had trouble comprehending and speaking. Hence the pressure on teachers of English as a foreign language to evolve procedures of presentation and practice of spoken English.

3. There has been continuing competition from other subjects in the curriculum, often armed with criticisms of our earlier accomplishment, summarized in the familiar accusation: "I studied high school French for three years and when I got to Paris I couldn't understand

anybody and nobody could understand my French." The practical importance of comprehension and speaking ability is undeniable, and the neglect of that ability during the past has not helped our standing in the world of education.

4. Practical importance has been emphasized by the post-Sputnik excitement about the "new" math, the "new" English; interestingly, we already had our "new key" before Sputnik.

All of these factors on the pedagogical and the general public levels have been reinforced by a theoretical influence, that of linguistics. It happens that the domain of pronunciation is the one in which linguistics could offer the most thorough and solid body of fact and doctrine. Thus, the influence of linguistic theory has been most immediate on the teaching of listening-and-speaking skills.

This insistence on an aural-oral component in foreign language instruction is sometimes misinterpreted as a radical shift in final objectives, a conversion or perversion of the whole experience of language learning. I hope that responsible language teachers and responsible linguists agree that listening and speaking are important language skills, that they constitute a proper approach to complete language mastery, but also that as an educational experience foreign language study must go beyond the practical conversational competences. Our present-day insistence on listening and speaking competence should represent an expansion rather than a shift of objectives. The various skills of reading have to be acquired and used, too. Indeed, the usual list of desirable competences runs: listening, speaking, reading, writing. If this is taken literally, the longer sequence of foreign language study would be very long indeed. (I risk an accusation of heresy in suggesting that writing is not the crowning skill, but rather for practically all learners of a foreign language the least relevant.)

One of the consequences of any longer sequence has been the promise that the enthusiasm for FLES—foreign language in the elementary school—can be justified if there is coordination of such elementary school learning into a rational total program.

But in the long-range history of our profession, the changes of the recent past—say the past ten years—have been more in the direction of the spread of earlier ideas than the development of important new ideas. We are constantly refining those earlier ideas. We know the limits of mimicry-memorizing better than we did twenty-five years ago. We know more about pattern practice. We have improved techniques to assure vocabulary and structure recurrence, including computer analysis. From linguistic descriptions we can pinpoint the predictable learning problems for a speaker of language A learning language B, and devise practice of a proper kind and amount and distribution. And more and

more foreign language teachers are becoming aware of these theoretical principles and are using these practical procedures more effectively.

For anything genuinely new in our field, we have to consider the development of programmed learning as applied to language learning.

I assume that the serious members of the profession these days are no more afraid of programmed learning than they are afraid of a computer. These things are not monsters that are going to put us out of business; they are going to help us do a better job.

Thinking about programmed learning of languages is not a frivolous excursion into science fiction; there is a lot to be learned about human teachers from study of machine teachers, and we can profit by soberly examining where we think we do a better job than a machine can do.

I suggest that there are two processes of language learning where the programmer faces very serious problems.

The first of these has to do with directing the practice of pronunciation. It is obvious that a feature of programmed learning is either the constant, monitoring control built into the program, or some kind of self-monitoring by the learner. The monitoring of pronunciation is going to be very difficult to contrive. Some ingenious attempts are being made to have pronunciation monitoring done mechanically. (The student makes a sound. A computer or some other device will compare the sound the student has made with some recorded model criterion sound, and then report to the student either that it was or was not satisfactory.) This solution presents enormous difficulties and expense in what we call the "hardware" for such comparison; and I think we had better plan to do without it for a while if we want to have generally available programmed learning of languages.

But if we do not have this kind of very expensive hardware, we must rely on the most unreliable kind of "software": namely, the student's own impression as to whether he is performing adequately or not. Linguistic theory and, I believe, pedagogical experience agree that it is an almost impossible assignment for the beginning language learner to hear his own mispronunciations of a foreign language. It would take too long to explain the basis in phonemic theory for this difficulty. Those of you who are versed in linguistic phonological theory will see at once why the beginning learner cannot hear his mistakes or else he would not be making them. The others will have to believe on the basis of experience in the classroom that this is what must be happening there, and would almost certainly happen in the booth.

Several well-informed programmers have tried to cope with this problem by developing special programs, not of language learning, but of monitoring-learning. The learner is put through a program of fifty to one hundred hours, simply learning how to monitor his foreign language pronunciation. We are reconciled in many kinds of learning situations to the need for a prereading period. In programmed learning there may have to be a "prespeaking period." This period may require 50-100 hours; if so, this is a considerable burden, a very large fraction for a good many learners of a language. It requires a highly motivated learner to be willing to put himself through this "prespeaking period" before he begins to learn the language. This need to train for self-monitoring is specifically and perhaps uniquely a language-learning problem in a big field of programmed learning.

The other problem that may be even more serious has to do with that crucial stage of language learning during which there is a massive expansion of the vocabulary. Most of us agree that for the oral-approach phase there should be a stern limitation on vocabulary in order to focus on the formation of desired habits of pronunciation and of sentence structure. Yet the limitation of the vocabulary for the first hundred or so hours of conventional instruction to under a thousand words, however necessary pedagogically, does not provide an adequate foundation for anything like a real use of the language.

During the first stage, during which vocabulary is artificially and rigorously limited, the language is being practiced, but it is not really being used. It is impossible to use a language if your vocabulary is drastically small; you can only practice it. Real use of the language demands a large vocabulary. We language teachers, and not merely our language programmer, are confronted with the unsolved problem of managing the massive, rapid, efficient expansion of vocabulary.

The linguist tells us two harsh things at this point.

There are no profitable matchings of words between languages, once you get past a few artificially limited concepts like "volt" or "carbon dioxide" or "the square root of minus one." Clearly there are words or phrases in several languages with almost identical meanings for such technical concepts. But for most of the vocabulary of a real language it is relatively unprofitable to go in for word matching between the foreign language and the learner's native language as a terminal-behavior goal. There may be an emergency help in temporarily equating a word encountered in the foreign language with one or more words in the student's native language; but that is only an emergency help, only a starting point. By the time that the student has learned really to use that foreign language word he has, we hope, ceased thinking of it in terms of English equivalents.

This nonequivalence of words between languages is one fact that the linguist points out to us: a word has its meaning or meanings because it is in a context or contexts. The meaning of a word is, among other things, the contexts in which it can occur. In slogan form: "Words do not have meanings, people have meanings for words." We know qualitatively that the vocabulary does not consist of a set of conversions from English to a foreign language or vice versa; the learner has to acquire non-English meanings for many, many words.

There is a much more horrifying quantitative fact about a vocabulary, a fact that is known to linguists and to some statisticians, but is not as widely known among foreign language teachers as it should be. This has to do with the distribution of the vocabulary in natural use of language. I can best suggest what the problem is by asking a question:

We have a million words of English on a computer tape at my institution. Those million words of English consist of a vocabulary of about fifty-thousand different words; that is, occurrences of those fifty-thousand words make up this million-word body of English. Now the question: How many of those fifty-thousand words do you think appear once and only once in a million words? The answer is twenty-two thousand, five hundred and ninety-eight. Very nearly half! And this is not a peculiarity of English. Every statistical study that has been made of natural language shows that almost one half the different word-forms in any text of any size occur once and only once. A horrifying fact, but a fact.

Some of you have seen the recent studies of J. Allen Pfeffer. He found there was a vocabulary of twenty-five thousand different words in about half a million words of spoken German that he investigated; and almost half of these occurred once and only once in his material.

Now, we are all familiar with high-frequency words in the foreign language we teach. We try to teach them early. It is obviously more important for our students to learn one of the hundred most frequent words than one of the words of frequency-rank two thousand. But how far does this principle hold? When do frequency differences become insignificant for learning purposes? How fast does pedagogical relevance of frequency lists begin to ravel out? Well, it begins to ravel out very fast indeed. In the Pfeffer statistics, we find that the one-hundredth most frequent word occurs about once every 772 words of text; the two-hundredth most frequent occurs about once every 2,301 words of text; and the five-hundredth about once every 8,040 words of text.

Put it differently: A vocabulary of three thousand word-forms is not large, heaven knows. But consider the three-thousandth word-form in a frequency list. What is the probability that it will occur within the next page (say 250 words of text) that you will read? — The odds are 100

to 1 that that word will not be on the next page.

That is to say, it is impossible to predict the words that you, or your student, will need to read the next page you or he will encounter. It is wasteful of time to try to predict your or his vocabulary needs. You or he cannot acquire in advance the vocabulary you or he need for any real use of language. We cannot give our students vocabulary resources that will be adequate. We must give them skills to compensate for the lack of resources.

What are the skills? They must be the skills that we use, that our students use in reading their native language, that we use in reading a foreign language—the skills of sensible guessing and toleration of vagueness. Sensible guessing and toleration of vagueness are anathema to conscientious teachers. "It is immoral to guess. You must look it up at the end of a book and know. It is immoral to be vague (vague = being unable to give an English word). It is immoral to treat some words as negligible."

But let me confess, I have encountered the word "osprey," I am sure, several times in my reading of English: O-S-P-R-E-Y. I am not sure that I have ever heard it. I am sure that an osprey is a bird. I think it is a bird that eats fish. I have a sort of feeling that I would be willing to bet that it eats saltwater fish. I do not know whether it is that big, or that big (gestures), because I have never looked up "osprey"; I have tolerated my vagueness. And, dear colleagues, if I had not tolerated my vagueness with "osprey" and probably at least fifteen thousand other English words, I would be tongue-tied.

Very well, if you agree with this hard saying, that the skill of reading is a delicate mixture of sensible guessing and toleration of vagueness, how can this be programmed? Programmed learning, as far as I am familiar with it, has the virtue of alerting a learner to a mistake before it has become a habit. Now, the one thing that the vocabulary-expanding learner does not need, must not have, is the experience of being alerted to a mistake. He must be encouraged in his fallible habit of sensible guessing. In guessing, he makes foolish mistakes. We all do. We misunderstand things. All of us must have the experience of finding that we have had a meaning for a word that most other people do not have. But most of the time, toleration of vagueness and sensible guessing have been out successful way of learning and expanding our vocabularies.

But how can this be programmed? I do not know the answer. But we must tell the language-learning programmer that he is up against this problem. What he must not do is destroy the confidence, however ill-founded, of the student who is beginning to tolerate vagueness, is beginning to be willing to go on to the next sentence even though he has left behind him an unfamiliar word. For going on to the next sentence is usually

far more important than cleaning up that particular unfamiliar word. (The classic in this case is the teacher who says, "Be sure you learn this word because it is so rare that you will probably never use it again.") Programmed learning must not subject the learner to that treatment, even in the mildest form.

These are, I suggest, relevant considerations for a change which we will all welcome, namely, the development of efficient language learning programs which will take from our shoulders some of the drudgery of teaching, which will take from our consciences the burden of holding some people back and pushing other people ahead.

I remind you that our look at the special language-teaching problems for programmed learning had something to teach us, that it was not a frivolous exercise in science fiction. For the problems of the programmer are our present problems, too. We, as language teachers, are probably least adequate at just these two points: pronunciation monitoring for beginning students, and guiding intermediate students toward vocabulary expansion through sensible guessing and toleration of vagueness.

The monitoring of pronunciation is inherently difficult where a class of large numbers of learners is involved - or, for that matter, even with classes of ordinary or even desirable size. If all the work is choral, it is hard to spot the unsatisfactory performance of an individual; if most of the work is individual, each individual performs only a small fraction of the time. Further, unless the teacher or the textbook has sketched a systematic schedule of pronunciation grading points, the corrections and practices are likely to be diffuse and random. The development of such a schedule, preferably a rational and linguistically calculated schedule, is a phase of classroom management that is all too rare.

The guidance for vocabulary expansion is in many ways even more difficult for the human teacher. At present we have to admit that some of our students have acquired an adequate reading vocabulary, but they did so with very little positive focused help from us. We can learn some guidelines from what we have seen about the programmer's pitfalls. For example, we should not force the learner to pay equal attention to all the words he encounters in his reading. We should not alert him to the possibility that he may only partially understand any particular word, or may be unfamiliar with any particular word. We should not reward him for being able to give us an approximate English equivalent for a particular word.

These are negative aids, to be sure. Perhaps for a while it is enough if we aren't downright hindrances to vocabulary expansion. If we can find some way to let the habits of sensible guessing and toleration of vagueness be transferred from the learner's reading habits in

his own language to those of the foreign language, we will be doing better than most of us are doing at present. And an awareness of the programmer's problem may help us avoid some of the pitfalls into which we are all too likely to fall. And perhaps if we fall less into those pitfalls, the intermediate stage may be less of a road to the graveyard than it has been for too large a proportion of foreign language students.

COMPUTATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO LANGUAGE TEACHING

John E. Allen, III

At first glance, the value of the computer in the language classroom may seem quite remote. Of course, we can easily understand the value of computers in advanced scholarly studies such as machine translation (MT), statistical studies, etc. We can even imagine a computer running a programmed-instruction operation although few schools would find it financially practical to do so.

Of what possible value, however, can the computer be to the language teacher who must still, primarily, teach a group of students to read, write, speak, and understand a foreign language?

Probably the most important area of contribution will be materials. One of the more consistent (and bitter?) complaints we have voiced in recent years has to do with the "unrealistic" nature of learning materials. Even those of us who are not native speakers of the languages we teach are, nonetheless, often aware that certain items of vocabulary that appear in learning texts are quite rare or even artificial. Similarly, in syntax, we often feel that some of the constructions introduced are virtually unused in the language while other constructions, in frequent usage, are not treated at all.

Further, textbooks often seem opinionated in matters of style, usage or "correctness" in ways that suggest bias based on the author's personal preferences.

Thus, in a textbook of English as a Second Language, to insist that lighted is the "standard" past tense formation is gratuitous in face of the widespread usage of lit. This example is neither unique nor contrived.

In Russian, for example, there are several hundred verbs which behave similarly, that is, show alternation of forms. A number of these verbs are quite common in usage and have, over the years, been a "Sprachgefühl" problem even for native speakers.

In Russian, we have solved the problem by placing over a million sentence-length examples in a computer for analysis. We found that certain alternates had no real currency at all and could be dismissed from practical consideration altogether. In other cases we found that certain alternates were peculiar to poetry, often because of stylistic or metrical considerations, and hardly a topic for first-year language study. In the cases where both of two forms were in fluctuating use in the language, it was often possible to discover some rule, if only "of thumb," to guide the selection of an individual form.

Here, then, is something the language teacher can put to work. Much good and important work of this nature is being done.

Linguists are using computers to select reading material. Several thousand five to eight page stories are placed in the computer for vocabulary analysis. The computer can select and arrange a selection of stories so that a maximum of high-frequency vocabulary is presented, arranged in such a way as to make the selections "most easily readable." Such readers are now in preparation in Russian, German, French, and Spanish.

Similar studies are now being done in syntax; statistical considerations of the relative frequencies of syntactic conformations. Thus, in English, which is more frequent in usage, the Perfect Indicative or the Past Indicative? If the Past Indicative is seven times more frequent in usage, clearly it should precede the Perfect Indicative in learning materials. Several such studies are in the works with important pedagogical promise.

Other areas such as word-frequency lists, concordances, etc., have already seen some activity and the pedagogical values are clear.

The computer, then, seems likely to make substantial improvement in our arsenal of realistic materials. After all, the majority of language teachers have felt and feel that inadequate, unrealistic, or nonexistent source and teaching materials comprise our greatest handicap. We may hope that the speed, accuracy, and data capacity of modern computer systems will offer substantial improvements in this direction.

THE USE OF NEW MEDIA AND MATERIALS

Dora S. Bashour

The materials revolution sparked by the A-LM has had both salutary and regrettable results. For along with the creation of other courses with a sound, bona fide structural approach, such as the Holt Ecouter et Parler series for several languages, there has been an upsurge in the publication of revamped editions of older texts which are blatantly hopping on the audio-lingual bandwagon. These new editions now include a proliferation of pattern drills and pronunciation exercises composed at times without a real understanding of the structural or phonological principles involved.

On the other hand, genuinely modern new-key texts are frequently the object of three criticisms: first, that the dialogue content is stultifyingly meager; second, that pattern practice is soporific; and third, that the memorization of dialogues throttles the student's imagination and fails to teach him to express himself in his own words. No individual course, however, can be all things to all men. Whether the text be new-key or old-hat, the teacher will, of course, first follow the author's instructions for its use. But the ingenious, creative teacher will never be satisfied with mere blind adherence to any text. He will contrive ways of enlivening and enriching it, and unless he develops the art of improvization on the materials at hand, his success as a teacher will be dubious.

Whatever the content and the quality of the courses appearing on the market today, all are accompanied by recordings that are generally well done. The sound reproduction is excellent, and their presentation of the voices of at least two natives has obvious advantages over many of the school-made recordings of a decade ago.

How these recordings are used depends, of course, on the available equipment. A tape recorder in every FL classroom would seem to be an absolute must. A language laboratory contributes immeasurably to raising the student's level of audio-lingual competency. Much has been said of the language laboratory, and its usefulness is by now axiomatic. But, as was proven conclusively by the research conducted in the public schools of this city, the effectiveness of the language laboratory is in direct proportion to the amount of time a student spends there. It is therefore to be hoped that administrators can be persuaded to schedule as much time for the language laboratory as for the science laboratory.

Within the last five years, another strong trend is increasingly evident, the addition (to language learning) of a third dimension, the visual. Genuinely integrated visual-audio-lingual courses are now available. The "package" includes not only the text, recorded dialogues and

drills, student's workbook, teacher's manual, tests and scoring scales, as in the A-LM, but also, as in the Holt and in the McGraw series, slides and filmstrip with synchronized soundtrack, or even regular sound film.

In order to ensure the scientific soundness of the structural approach, the application of the best in contemporary methodology, and the authenticity of the language and the cultural material, new-key courses are usually the work of a team of experts: master teachers, linguists, native informants. The courses with integrated visual materials also include audio-visual specialists and even artists. The old stick drawings and cartoons are giving way to handsome colored pictures, and we have come a long way from the realia concept of the past. Although for some, the relative importance of the linguistic and the cultural aims of FL study is still open to discussion, it is certain that a wholesome balance between them can be achieved with courses of this type.

More recently, FL teaching by television has come of age. Such programs as Parlons Français and the project of the Detroit public schools have been reaching literally millions of children. The success of T.V. teaching has caused pioneers in the FL field to take another look at the T.V. screen, and fruitful experimentation is underway on the implications of this kind of teaching for the language laboratory. Already one university is installing a new laboratory with a screen in every booth. Thus a student assuming one of the roles in a dialogue can converse with a "live" native on the screen in a culturally authentic setting.

But whatever the nature of the teaching materials and the sophistication of the media for their use, in the final analysis, their effectiveness remains in the hands of the teacher, and no program can be any better than the teacher using it.

CHANGES IN TEACHER PREPARATION

Leo U. Benardo

Although the past five years have brought vast changes in methodology and curriculum, relatively little has been done outside of NDEA summer institutes in either licensing or preparation of teachers of foreign languages.

The following are suggested as avenues of approach in the improvement of programs in the preparation of language teachers:

1. A required Junior Year Abroad for all prospective teachers of modern languages.

2. A return to the Teacher-in-Training program in which beginning teachers are given a lighter class load and ample opportunity to observe and confer with experienced teachers in the department.

3. A more carefully developed student teacher program in which methods courses are given by active practitioners in the primary or secondary schools and in which "cooperating teachers" are selected for outstanding ability in the field with adequate compensation for their work with the assigned student teacher.

4. A required "linguistics sequence" for all teachers of modern languages.

5. A liberalized sabbatical leave abroad for language teachers in order to maintain language fluency and to develop real awareness of cultural changes.

6. The use of native informants as assistant teachers for on-the-spot availability in tape preparation, dialogue models, etc.

7. A broadened teacher exchange program with foreign countries for interchange of ideas and methods.

8. A joint University-Board of Education certification procedure for prospective teachers.

CHANGES IN OBJECTIVES AND CURRICULUM

Gladys Lipton

It might be interesting to give you, the audience, a brief quiz. The purpose of this little test is to determine whether you can pinpoint when some of the changes in foreign language instruction were first advocated. You will hear three principles of foreign language instruction; then, considering all three principles together, you are to choose the period of time preceded by the letters a, b, c:

Principle 1: The first duty of a teacher is to make the students perfectly familiar with the sound of the foreign language.

Principle 2: The instructor will teach the most common phrases and idiomatic expressions of the foreign language. To do this, he will teach dialogues, descriptions, and narratives that are easy, natural, and interesting as possible.

Principle 3: As much as possible, he will relate the expressions of the foreign language directly to the ideas or to other expressions of the same language, not to those of the maternal language.

Now for the test. Remember, considering these three principles together, would you say they were advocated: a) before 1955? b) between 1955 and 1960? c) between 1960 and 1965? These principles (and others) were laid down by the International Phonetic Association in 1895, and by others before that, and one could easily say that they have been prominent in the changes in foreign language instruction within the last decade. Thus we see that formerly, as now, there have been divergent points of view.

For many people, there has been a large-scale language revolution, although, incredible as it sounds, there are still some foreign language teachers who have remained untouched by it. This revolution has taken our profession away from reading-translation goals to the recognition of a fourfold approach needed to achieve effective communication in the foreign language. To be sure, there have been excesses of emphasis and neglect; for this reason, it might be well to cite the objectives listed by the United States Office of Education under NDEA Title III Guidelines:

1. To understand a foreign language when spoken at normal tempo on a subject within the range of the pupil's experience

2. To speak sufficiently to make direct contact with a native on a subject within the range of the pupil's experience

3. To read with direct understanding, without recourse to English translation, material on a general subject

4. To write, using the authentic patterns of the language without conscious reference to English

These aspirations are reasonable, realizable, and responsive to the needs of the foreign language profession. But they must be implemented effectively by a curriculum that

- provides for longer sequences of instruction (for obviously we cannot hope to achieve these goals within the two-year sequence that many schools still offer)

- includes sequential, uninterrupted steps in a 10-year program beginning with FLES in grade 3 and continuing through grade 12

- is flexible enough to include some of the best aspects of all approaches, utilizes the ever-increasing results and implications of research, maintains a balance of auditory and graphic skills, and establishes an inherent stability in order to withstand the extreme swings of the pendulum which are bound to occur.

It has been said that change is the only constant. Therefore, we should not fear change, for we have been the beneficiaries of renewed public and professional interest. However, we must be most circumspect to prevent a "lemming-like rush to the sea" to drown the objectives of audiolingualism. I share the concern of Professor Hawley, of the University of Wyoming when he warns:

> "...many teachers who favor the traditional method of teaching language and who always have considered the new methodology suspect ...may consider only the adverse comments in order to justify discarding the audio-lingual techniques completely in favor of a return to the old ways; and this, in my opinion, would erase many of the gains which language study has made during the past decade."[1]

[1]Hawley, D.C., "In Search of a Synthesis," Modern Language Journal (January 1960), p. 20.

EVALUATION OF LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT AND INSTRUCTION

Robert J. Ludwig

1. The testing of speech continues to be the weakest link in the language evaluation process. Among the needs in this area we have: achievement tests for FLES students moving on to the junior high school; differentiated tests for FLES students being compared with students beginning instruction on the secondary level; and more challenging questions for fourth-level students. If teacher certification were based not only on the completion of course offerings but also on the MLA proficiency examinations or their equivalents, bureaus of testing would not be so emphatic about the inability of language teachers to objectively score individually administered speaking tests. The New York State Federation of Foreign Language Teachers is seeking foundation support to construct specimen examinations.

2. Improvement in listening comprehension testing has come as accent has been removed from memory retention. Research in basic spoken word lists has enabled the use of high-frequency vocabulary. College Board tests should require both the listening and reading comprehension tests for language achievement and should develop batteries to test speech and writing as well. Advanced students should be able to hear a condensed lecture in the foreign language and take notes, a technique which might be incorporated in fourth-level testing.

3. The testing of reading should be based on language ability and experience rather than predominantly on raw native ability. Material should be appropriate to the experiential level of the test, and vocabulary should represent high-frequency lexical items and structures.

4. The testing of writing should focus on structure. Premature expectations in the area of free composition should be avoided. The use of pictures to stimulate a connected paragraph which is thereby controlled should be developed.

5. Teachers on all levels should become acquainted or reacquainted with the contents of the New York State Syllabi in Foreign Languages. The Regents Examinations reflect the basic principles enunciated in this document. The pioneer efforts of Nelson Brooks and Associates in the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests have had a profound influence on language evaluation.

6. The need to include testing in the area of culture and civilization in the broadest use of those terms should be an integral part of the evaluation process.

7. Each teacher needs to utilize self-evaluation constantly and determine whether or not the language class is a pleasurable experience to the participants. The art of teaching must never be divorced from the content of teaching. Technical competence must be accompanied by personal growth and self-understanding.